

TLU-4 Comments
Recommendation 29
Financial and market incentives for low GHG vehicle ownership and use

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

Government meddling/incentives rarely result in progress. Montana should be working to remove barriers to progress not impeding them by adding bureaucracy that adds no value to the end product. Furthermore, this report was based on a politically correct directive which assumes there is a man-made climate crisis. While this assumption has the backing of the media and politicians it has little support from the scientific community. Hence the reporting by the media of the relative minority that support the theory. Technology should be able to stand on its own merits without government incentives.

I really like the rebates/tax credits idea and the consumer labeling idea. The fees on high emission/low MPG vehicles is harder to support.

Requirements for consumer labeling will add to the cost for all of us.

With our topography and types of businesses, Montanans need to be able to drive whatever they choose to without being charged a "penalty."

There should be a cost/benefit analysis required. The benefits do not justify the costs using sound science. More taxes, regulations and red tape is not what will help Montana.

Where's all this money coming from?

This should be accomplished at the national level or by a coalition of western states including California NOT by Montana acting alone.

I am not a logger but even I can see that this would penalize the loggers.....are you trying to take away the means of making a living in a significant portion of this state?? What happens to your tax revenues then????

We just bought a Toyota Highlander SUV hybrid and we love it. It gets much better gas mileage than our Jeep ever did. It not only gets better MPG, but is also far less polluting (and even more powerful when the gas and electric systems work in concert)However, it is my understanding that in Montana there are no tax incentives for this expensive purchase.

The tax credits should be extended to after-market retrofits too. The federal credit applies only to new vehicles, but cars aren't disposable. My gran's saying "use it up, wear it out, live within or live without" has to hold some weight - right?? :o)

These are incentives that will save the State future expenses on the clean-up side of the curve. Prevention first!

Feds should lead here. Montana has no market power. Farmers and ranchers would be hurt the most by this proposal.

How do you include the consumers of used vehicles in this category?

Remove the current subsidies that reward bad behavior, and we'll eliminate the need for subsidies to force good behavior. We'll save money all around.

How about forcing the big car and oil companies to redevelop an engine will less pollution and more mpg?

Fully support incentives on low emitting, high mpg vehicles. I would like to see MT set up incentives asap!

Help make them little cars less expensive - this is a selfish wish on my part. I'm eyeing a new Toyota Corolla when the Metro dies.

Individuals can only do so much with this issue, we need strong and numerous government action of many forms and formats...

I support rebates - not legislation

Also, consider tax credits for those who drive less than x miles per year.

Doesn't the high cost of fuel already provide the most effective incentive.

Vehicle fees and taxes are already very high in this Montana.

Look to the UN-intended consequences. Let the market do its job. Like most government involvement in an issue, it is well intentioned, but will ultimately make the situation more cumbersome and expensive.

Now if Detroit comes through with some more cars on the high efficiency end...

Good Idea. If people want to drive big gas guzzlers then they should be taxed.

Montana is still an ag-based state where large low MPG vehicles are necessary for farm and ranch operations.

Obviously, the rebates or tax credits for low emission/high mpg vehicles should be funded by the taxes on the high emission/low mpg vehicles. i.e. don't do one OR the other, do both.

Internalizing the cost of energy wastefulness and global warming is a must. Why should someone be able to drive a Hummer on subsidized fuel and roads, while my kids are going to pay enormous costs to clean up the mess?

I do not support fees or taxes based on GHG emissions or anything related to so-called "global warming".

Rebates and tax credits reward only those who can afford to buy new vehicles.

Low GHG vehicle cause more deaths on our roads.

NO NEW Fees based on poor science. See Avery and Singer on the web.

Stop funding the flog war. Use all these incentives to create jobs so I can get a job that pays more than \$8 an hour take home so I can buy a newer car, though the one I have now gets 30 mpg.

I think it is better to give rebates than punish those who cannot afford to buy a new car. There is also an environmental cost to our over consumption of vehicles. It is just plain unfair to put a fee on older cars - perhaps consider new cars/trucks, but there should be an exemption for people who use their vehicle for work related reasons - farm, logging, tow trucks.

Tax credits to make high MPG vehicles more attractive is a good idea, but there is nothing to justify a penalty on low MPG vehicles. You shouldn't artificially limit consumer choice.

Bingo!

How will imposing such fees provide incentive or help our poorest residents, who can only afford to buy and maintain insurance on older vehicles? Obviously, Hummer owners don't count here - maybe impose fees on those folks who purchase new or nearly new vehicles, with high emission/low mpg rates.

legislation is NEVER the answer.

I would think that this information is already available or soon will be.

This could be an effective revenue neutral tool.

Here again the legislative solution raises the cost on too many Montanan's who depend of these vehicles for their livelihood like farmers and ranchers and businesses who need them. In Montana we don't drive SUV and light trucks for fun. WE drive them because we have to to get around in the winter and on our backroads. Call it a Fee or a Tax, it's still an expensive penalty for Montanan's

No more fees (taxes)

I know all this is going to cost taxpayers' money, but some really good ideas here! We should be responsible for cleaning up our messes--not expecting everything to just go away and leave it for our kids/grandkids/ etc.

I would prefer to see fee taken at the purchase of the vehicle since not all of us can buy new cars.

Just don't sell anything that emits higher levels! Come on...this isn't rocket science.

use both a carrot and a stick

Low income people cannot afford to replace their vehicles as it is-this will just drive up costs.

Tax vehicles on a formula that includes gross weight, miles driven and rated efficiency, not just value. That is an incentive! We are so backwards on this is is disgusting.

Depends on how this is done.

NO MORE TAXES

Again economic rules. Waste of time.

Fees pay for rebates.

Studies show that there is zero climate benefit to such investments. Clearly there is no consensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

Montana citizens do not need any new fees. Many, many Montanans drive older vehicles because that is what they can afford or because an older vehicle serves their needs. Government should stay away from fees, rebates, tax credits--let Montana drivers decide what they want to drive!!!

FEES LIKE THIS ARE ALWAYS EASILY ABSORBED AND IGNORED BY THE WEALTHY. LOW-INCOME MONTANANS WOULD UNFAIRLY BEAR THE BRUNT OF THIS.

Skip the analysis. Start learning by doing.

Terrible idea! Let's get moving on alternative to private vehicles.

May support incentives and credits for high MPG vehicles

The market system will eventually flush these out - this does not have to happen immediately, but over a long time period

As noted above-what about public transportation especially rail, to link cities like Missoula and Billings, reduce emissions from vehicles driving long distances.

We just need car manufacturers to make something we can afford to buy

I would not support any additional taxes on 2009 or newer vehicles. If this was placed on 2010 model year or later, then fine.

Who is going to pay for this detailed analysis? Let me guess, the taxpayers! How about the auto makers instead, it seems they reap the rewards of the sales, regardless of the type of vehicle so it stands to figure they should bear the burden, it will be costly. I speculate that it will be passed to the consumer which leads back up to my comments earlier about affordability.

Where would the fees go? Does a new governmental agency have to be established or increased in size to accommodate?

Let the market place dictate. Let me chose which type vehicle I want to and can afford to drive.

With the prices rapidly increasing, conserving natural resources is a matter the free market can handle without government mandates.

This could be called a "negative incentive" and is just another bad idea in our State.

Again, this will hit the poor greatest.

tax credits, but not fees.

So, punishing people because they can't afford another car with lower MPG? Why do you think it's any of YOUR business what gas mileage other people's cars have?

An effective carrot.

where would the rebated come from?

Fees on high emission, low MPG vehicles==ok for new vehicles, opposed to fees on used vehicles.
Rebates or tax credits on low emission, high MPG vehicles would be beneficial.

Ok with incentives for "greener" vehicles, but the high mpg customers already pay at the pump. That is not going to change anytime soon. I don't support government trying to mandate conformity.

Great!

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. No new taxes. Montana's poor and middle class cannot pay any more for energy.

Another example of two concepts in one option. incentives might work but we cannot put penalties on people who need certain vehicles for their work

<http://www.righttalk.com/asx/ggws.asx>

NO NEW FEES FOR MONTANA RESIDENTS

Not practical in Montana.

There are millions of vehicles on the highways which would not meet these standards. Place the standards on new vehicles but do not place them on the existing vehicles.

Technology and advancement in emission management will negate the need for Montana to legislate more fees on vehicle use. Heavey vehicle use will be severely impacted by more fees.

Oh No! Another way to tax us. I know the governor is concerned about high taxes, but how high does he want them to go. I have lost track of the incentives, and fees that have been proposed, but i have not lost tract of the fact that the consumer--taxpayer, will foot the bill for these regulations. That in my opinion are unneeded

AGAIN! Stay out of it! We don't need more government. The market will do this. Look at the administrative costs of FEEBATES and TAXES. Excise taxes would not remain the same, look at the cost of changing the system and look at who would be impacted. These are people you are taxing for some nebulous cause. What is the socio-economic profile of those who would be impacted most?

Rebates and credits, good. Lesgislation, bad.

Selective taxation; not a good idea.

First lets us design low MPG trucks and family cars .Then increase the governors tax refund to make up for the increase in our food etc, that will undoubtedly be passed on. Of course if all the US reps and senators want to donate a portion of their reitremtn to pay these fees then that is ok too.

This is already being done to some extent at the Federal Level. If I choose to drive a gas hog I am already paying more for less and will use it less when the fuel price becomes to high. The market will bear this out and already has as you see car companies producing large suv's and pickups that are fuel efficient or hybrid cars. Conversely when we save enough fuel that we have to raise the tax to keep the roads up people will switch to these vehicles on their own.

Many Montanan's purchase heavier duty autos and light trucks because of rural roads, snow, work utilization. These kinds of programs would penalize them.

i don't want to use a little unreliable vehicle to travel the Montana roads during our winters

Rather than punish users, provide incentives to purchase higher mpg, etc. vehicles. Again, the socialism in you is disgusting.

This doesn't seem as effective as TLU-2 &3.

It's a great idea, if its possible...and economically feasible.

I am not a free market radical, but this issue should be a market driven choice. Consumers will look at the long term cost of ownership

The price of gas is going to take care of this.

Farmers & ranchers love this proposal. Tax the big trucks.

NEEDED? Says who? I say not. Again, let the markets decide when all this stuff is "NEEDED"

Only if industries and corporations pay their fair share. Agribusiness has some of the most polluting equipment - don't let them off the hook.

Gradually put them into place. Make sure that these vehicles are available to public to purchase. It would be unfair to tax folks if the vehicles are not available. Include snowmobiles!!!

YES!!

Montana is cow and farm country. Also have hunters and sportsman. Many of these vehicles would fit in the category.

I am for the rebates and tax credits for LEV/high MPG vehicles. I am AGAINST fees for high emission low MPG vehicles. In MT, many of us can only afford one vehicle, and it needs to be a truck. Unlike in California, we live in a state that requires a high amount of traveling to conduct both commercial and personal business. This would just be a fee imposed on Montanans for being Montanans.

raise taxes and tax breaks for the rich. If its such a good deal, why do the rich need incentives.

Not unless older vehicles (which itself saves the earth instead of damage caused by new products) and so those unable to afford would be punished.

This is all well and good if you can afford a new car or truck. MANY Montanans cannot. Many have little choice of what they drive. They should not be penalized for it.

"Government is not the solution to our problems, it IS the problem"

Incentives for not driving at all would be much more intelligent from an environmental and cost perspective. Incentives for taking the train and carpooling, for example. If I don't have a car, I should get more money than those who do, even if that car is "environmentally friendly."

This is an unnecessary intrusion by government into personal choice in vehicles. It has no scientific basis.

I prefer rebates or tax credits on low emission, high MPG vehicles. Since most of us drive SUV's in Montana, it depends what you label as low MPG vehicles. The average SUV gets 15mpg in the city, so I think maybe 12MPG would be ok to create extra fees on.

if you need a gas guzzler and can afford gas, it's your problem.

Tax incentives for low emission vehicles would make this plan desirable; fees for high emissions vehicles is an offensive burden from the state and makes this plan unsupportable for me. State encouragement on a choice of vehicle is acceptable to me. The state imposing a fine on a citizen for exercising a legal choice is unacceptable to me and amounts to punishment, thus making such a program distasteful

All this will do is raise the cost of driving.

Fees? Stinkin Democrats.

This proposal would highly impact the agricultural economy. NO!!!!

Is this possible?

Should have already been in place with greater incentives.

Should be nation-wide. Don't penalize Montanans!

More taxes to pay! What about the person that needs a lower MPG type vehicle for business? Slap him with a big tax and give a token of it to some guy driving an unsafe rollerskate!

Very good idea, but maybe conflicting with the 'voluntary energy efficiency standards' by creating a non-voluntary fee? This could be implemented later if the voluntary measures are not successful.

Economics will dictate auto market, not Government.

Scientific theories on global warming do not warrant new taxes or legislation. Need additional analysis to understand impact on consumers and penalties on business development.

I agree Vehicles definitely can be improved but are not as large a problem as our coal power production - not even close!

Yes.

Montana is a big empty state, we have to drive long distances to get anywhere. This is just another unjustified tax making it harder for people to live in Montana.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Let folks buy what they want and no legislation. Too much government in our lives anyway,

The State of Montana was not designed to be in the automobile business. That is for private industry.

More taxes and fees?

This is not needed, if it were so good, these unsafe cars would sell better.

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bulls**t legislation. Global warming is NOT a fact (cold records set last winter in the southern hemisphere) so it might be Northern hemisphere warming, but not global. Secondly, latest studies of the sun spots (that control global temperatures more than humans) indicate that within 20 years we will be back in a 'mini-ice age'. Not politically correct, but MUCH more accurate.

So, if someone cannot afford to acquire a low MPG vehicle, this proposal would put a fee on the vehicle??!! Where is our concern going for the low income people of Montana that must drive what they drive. What about business and farmers that need certain types of vehicles??!! These proposals appear to be out of control and the people that proposed them are not in touch with Montana.

Agriculture needs to be exempt.

Was there consideration for people with limited income who drive old vehicles?

Another unnecessary busy-work computations, labor intensive for the value derived.

Great idea! We wouldn't want any rich people driving Rolls Royces in Montana! Might make things prosperous.

Something like this is mostly going to effect the people who rely on their trucks for a living. I agree that people who don't need a large low MPG vehicles should be penalized for buying them, but mostly people who have to have these vehicles are going to suffer. I agree with incentivising people for being green (positive reinforcement) but penalizing people who have little choice isn't the way to go (negative reinforcement)!

These provide a distortion in the free market which would increase the use of particular vehicles without any guarantee that the expected savings are able to be recovered.

More draconian regulation? Isn't the price of fuel incentive enough?

The tax code should not be used for social engineering. Studies have shown that positive reinforcement does more to change behavior than punishment. The Governor recognized this when he proposed incentives for people who purchase what are categorized as eco friendly cars. The Commissions own study states that Montana's car market is too small to have an effect on the types of vehicles that manufacturers put into the market place. (Appendix H, p. H-14) This proposal only punishes the people of Montana with a new tax.

On vehicles purchased after 2010?

Some wealthier people are almost immune to market incentives, and market incentives unfairly impact poor people. While I support this, vehicle manufacturers should be required to produce vehicles with less environmental impact.

Some people and industries prefer or require lower MPG vehicles. I will not support taxing them.

C'mon-I could write this stuff in days--2010?-a requirement would do it!!?

maybe on this one?

Have a deadline to remove all inefficient vehicles from the road - 2020 or so.

Again help must be given to the poor to get into compliance.

Start with new vehicles, after a few years, add older vehicles. Give lower-income people time to be able to buy a used vehicle which meets standards.

Use the carrot rather than the stick. Some folks need a big truck to haul stuff. How many big round bales will fit in a Prius? Let folks make thier own decissions whether it is worth it to take advantage of a tax incentive. In the near future gas prices will probably do more to encourage conservation than will either taxes (which will be resented) or tax incentives.

YES !!!

Stay out of it & let the market determine what's best.

good idea.

No legislation!

I think that the vehicles should be improved and made available, but not after the fact fees. I favor incentives to change behavior, not threats.

divide and conquer! tax one group and give some to another and EQC keep`s the rest.

No!!! Where does this money come from to fund such incentives? No one wants more fees to pay!!! Legislation not needed. Motorists will respond to the cost of fuel. Why penalize those who need lower mileage pick-ups vs. small car to make a living.

I couldn't find "feebates" in my dictionary. Please don't create another monster.

This is not needed.

Poor people would become even poorer.

Outstanding.

This recommendation could lead to increased costs to consumers and should be analyzed to determine total cost to consumers.

Heck no. The cost of operation is already enough of a pain in the wallet for those in this LOW PER CAPITA INCOME STATE.

What about an electric car that gets its power from a coal-fired plant? How are emissions measured and fees assessed or rebates given?

I could support some form of this if a cooperative effort is made so there is no implementation of demonization.

This policy would create a hardship for low income Montanans.

Unnecessary mandate.

Use national carbon tax or cap and trade to provide incentives. Don't dream up your own based on your preferences.

Again, don't penalize farmers and ranchers for using standard vehicles for heavy hauling and towing.

Let the market decide the price of vehicles.

Depends on who pays. If trucks for businesses get taxed consumers pay. If it is purely a tax on personal vehicles and credit on personal maybe.

Steve Running: drive 65

Only people who already can afford new cars would benefit. Many people who are not able to buy new cars, are forced to buy used ones that are not as fuel efficient. Again only those who can already afford a new car would benefit.

sooner

Tax suv useage, as well as pickups, etc. that get lousy mpg

efficiency of semi-tractors is a whole lot different than a hybred used to commute a hour every day, even though both are needed for working different jobs.

Pay as you drive insurance would be nice to include.

Out of proportion penalizing low income workers who need older vehicles, but make too much for poverty level cutoff.

People dont need new taxes (fees). Most folks will get tired of paying more for fuel and they will make the decision. Folks do not want govt mandating everything.

A national issue.

I support rebates for higher MPG vehicles, but NO EXTRA FEES for those that are not. That's kicking a horse when it's down, and it is not right.

Seen annual vehicle exhaust emissions inspections comment above. This may accomplish some of the objectives and should be done regardless.

ANOTHER ATTACK ON THE RECREATIONAL VEHICLE USER---YOU KNOW---THE ONES PAYINY THE BULK OF THOSE FEES "NOW"

Let's see that legislation!

Incentives rather than punitive measures. Emphasize the self interest and keep the rebates/incentives low.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.

should be kept at national level for uniformity

Remember this is MT. Education is okay, but fees on larger vehicles needed for our rural lifestyle is not needed. Lets go after the low hanging fruit on GHG reductions - not everything some city dweller could think of.

We already pay more at the pump for low MPG vehicles. In many places in MT these are needed for work and/or transportation and recreation. This is a new tax for no purpose. The tax does not reduce emissions - it raises costs to businesses and consumers - and raises revenue for the government.

there is climate change. But mans impact is limited. Maybe as little as less than 3-5% need cost benefit analysis

Move big brother trying to tell us how to live and act. Driven by myths.

provide incentives, not legislated punishment. Market forces will drive this change.

Holcim supports the use of incentives to increase low-GHG passenger vehicle ownership.

We have a lot of lower class people How are they going to afford this one??

great idea, who would be watch dog?

low income people cannot afford a prius. This is a subsidy for the rich.

We should go to ethanol year round right now.

Some people don't have the money to choose a new more efficient vehicle.